

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 3. This sheet, which included Fig. 3, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 3. Fig. 3, previously identified block 11 as “Core Network (CN) Operator A (PLMN262-99)” should read “Core Network (CN) Operator B (PLMN262-99).”

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

Annotated Sheet Showing change

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This communication is in response to the Non-Final Office Action dated August 4, 2009. Claims 1-29 were previously canceled, without prejudice. Claims 30, 31, 33, 34, 38-43, 45 and 53 have been amended. New independent claim 58 has been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 30-58 remain pending in this application with claims 30 and 58 being the only independent claims. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 30-41, 44-55 and 57 are rejected as obvious over Kauranen et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No.: 2004/0162077) in view of Park et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,741,868).

Claims 42 and 43 are rejected as obvious over Kauranen et al in view of Park et al. and Stephenson et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,119,000).

Claim 56 is rejected as obvious over Kauranen et al in view of Part et al. and Purnadi et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0068565).

Applicants respectfully traverse the outstanding prior art rejections for at least the reasons discussed below.

Applicants draw the Examiner's attention to an inadvertent typographical error in the headings for the prior art rejections which refer by number to the previous prior art references (e.g., US Patent No. 7,236,784 & 7,110,788 in paragraphs 15 & 17) that were withdrawn by the Examiner as failing to predate the effective filing date of the present invention.

Independent Claim 30

Claim 30 calls for “transmitting more than one mobile radio operator identity, PLMN identity, on an organization channel BCCH” and “transmitting the more than one PLMN identity in a mobile radio system operating according to the UMTS standard in the Master Information Block (MIB) or in System Information Block 1 (SIB1), or in a mobile radio system operating according to the GSM standard on the System Information Type 3 (SI3).” (emphasis added)

The Examiner acknowledges that Kauranen et al. fails to disclose this limitation instead

relying on Park et al. for teaching this missing element. “Park teaches a method and apparatus for interfacing among mobile terminal, base station and core network in mobile telecommunications system whereby a PLMN identify the RNC sends the system information message having a master information block (MIB) to the hybrid type asynchronous terminal over a BCCH.” {August 4, 2009 Non-Final Office Action: p. 3, ll. 3-7} (emphasis added) As recognized by the Examiner in his remarks, Park et al. discloses only a single PLMN identity in the system information message transmitted by the RNC to the terminal over a BCCH (*see* Col. 21, l. 64). In contrast, the present claimed invention calls for “transmitting more than one mobile radio operator identity, PLMN identity, on an organization channel BCCH.” The specification of the present invention expressly recognized that “The selection of the mobile radio operators is based on the existence of a unique ID (PLMN ID) on the BCCH of each mobile radio access network. Conventional systems are not capable of transmitting more than one mobile radio network operator ID (PLMN ID) on the BCCH of a mobile radio access network.” (Specification of present application: p. 4, ll. 8-11) Park et al. is such a conventional system in which only a single PLMN ID is transmitted over a BCCH.

New independent claim 58 contains a similar limitation to that found in independent claim 30. Specifically, claim 58 specifies “transmitting on the common organization channel BCCH more than one PLMN identity in a mobile radio system operating according to UMTS standard in Master Information Block (MIB) and/or in System Information Block 1 (SIB1), or in a mobile radio system operating according to GSM standard in System Information Type 3 (SI3).” Accordingly, claim 58 is thus patentable over the prior art of record for at least similar reasons discussed above with respect to claim 30

Dependent Claim 32

Claim 32 further specifies “wherein network elements of the core network (6, 7; 10, 11) (CN) are used for providing voice connections (MSC), whereas other network elements for providing IP connections (packet network, GSN) are each provided by the different operators.” (emphasis added)

In rejecting claim 32 the Examiner states this limitation is taught by reference element numbers 120 and 124 in Figure 1 of Kauranen et al. However, MSC 121 and GGSN 124 in Figure 1 of Kauranen et al. are associated with the same operator (Core network 120), rather than different operators.

Dependent Claim 33

Claim 33 is further distinguishable over the prior art in that it provides “wherein more than one PLMN identity is transmitted in a different System Information Block other than the Master Information Block (MIB) and the System Information Block 1 (SIB1) on the BCCH of a mobile radio system operating according to the UMTS standard.” (emphasis added)

Kauranen et al., as acknowledged by the Examiner, fails to disclose the PLMN identity transmitted in the BCCH. Nevertheless, the Examiner maintains that Park et al. teaches transmission of the PLMN identity in the BCCH, as found in claim 33. Applicants submit that claim 33 is distinguishable over Kauranen et al. as modified by Park et al. As previously mentioned with respect to claim 30, neither reference alone or in combination thereof teaches transmitting “more than one PLMN identity,” instead only a single PLMN identity is transmitted in Park et al. in the BCCH. (Col. 21, l. 64) Furthermore, the transmission of the system information in Park et al. is in the master information block (MIB) (Col. 21 l. 66 through Col. 22, l. 1), rather than “in a different System Information Block other than the Master Information Block (MIB) and the System Information Block 1 (SIB1) on the BCCH,” as called for in claim 33. (emphasis added)

Dependent Claim 38

Claim 38 states “wherein when a connection is requested, the subscriber/the subscriber terminal (13) notifies the radio access network (9; 12) of the different core networks (6, 7; 10, 11) with which the connection is to be set up, and that this notification occurs with the transmission of the network operator ID (for example PLMN ID) in the RRC CONNECTION REQUEST or the INITIAL DIRECT TRANSFER message in a mobile radio system operating according to the UMTS standard, wherein only the MCC of the PLMN identity is transmitted.” (emphasis added)

In rejecting claim 38 the Examiner maintains that this limitation is taught by Kauranen et al. which discloses transmission of either the PLMN (which includes both MMC and MNC) or, alternatively, in the case of operators having dedicated radio frequencies only MNC are transmitted. (Paragraph [0040]) Therefore, Kauranen et al. fails to disclose or suggest only the MCC of the PLMN identity being transmitted, as found in claim 38.

Dependent Claim 39

Claim 39 is still further distinguishable over the prior art in that it states “wherein the PLMN identity is represented by an integer (1, 2, 3...n) or a bit string (e.g., “001”), and the actual PLMN identity is determined from the sequential order of transmission of the different PLMN identities on the BCCH.”

Nothing in either Kauranen et al. or Park et al., either alone or in combination thereof teach this limitation. Nor has the Examiner expressly stated in paragraph 7 of the August 4, 2009 Office Action where in the references such limitation is taught.

Dependent Claim 40

Claim 40 provides “wherein when a connection is requested, the subscriber/the subscriber terminal (13) notifies the radio access network (9; 12) of the different core networks (6, 7; 10, 11) with which the connection is to be set up, and that this notification occurs with the transmission of the network operator ID (PLMN ID) neither in the RRC CONNECTION REQUEST nor the INITIAL DIRECT TRANSFER message in a mobile radio system operating according to the UMTS standard.” (emphasis added)

Kauranen et al. discloses that the connection is set up between the terminal and core network via the RAN using an initial direct transfer (paragraph [0042]), whereas, to the contrary, claim 40 expressly provides that the notification does not occur with the network operator ID in the INITIAL DIRECT TRANSFER message.

Dependent Claim 41

Claim 40 provides “wherein more than one PLMN ID is transmitted in the System Information Block 1 (SIB1) on the BCCH of a mobile radio system operating according to the UMTS standard or core network information of more than one core network is transmitted within an SIB1.” (emphasis added)

Park et al. to which the Examiner refers teaches transmitting the information in the MIB, not the SIB, as in claim 40. (Col. 21, line 66 through Col. 22, l. 1)

Dependent Claims 42 and 43

Claims 42 and 43 each specify “wherein a signal represented, for example, by a single bit is transmitted on the organization channel (BCCH) of the radio access network (9; 12) to indicate if the radio network resources administration unit (RCN and/or BSC) provides the connection request of the subscriber/the subscriber terminal (13) with one of the core networks (6, 7; 10, 11) based on the IMSI of the subscriber terminal.” (emphasis added)

The Examiner acknowledges that this limitation is not taught by either Kauranen et al. or Park et al., instead relying on yet a third prior art reference, Stephenson et al. Applicants respectfully disagree. The combination of all three references still does not read on the present claimed invention which calls for “a single bit” based on the IMSI of the subscriber terminal. Stephenson et al. discloses (Col. 8, ll. 8- 21) that the IMSI which is provided to the PLMN ID in the form of a TMSI is a four octet code, not a single bit.

Dependent Claim 46

Claim 46 further specifies “wherein additional PLMN IDs are always transmitted when a subscriber terminal (13) logs on to a mobile radio network for the purpose of registration, actually uses a service, or indicates its actual location to the mobile radio network.” (emphasis added)

Kauranen et al. fails to mention whatsoever additional PLMN ID’s, much less, when such additional PLMN ID’s are to be transmitted. Kauranen et al. (paragraph [0040] to which the Examiner refers) does not disclose when either PLMN ID’s or additional PLMN ID’s are broadcast.

Dependent Claim 53

Claim 53, as amended, further provides “wherein the selection of the PLMN or of these core network elements (MSC or GSN) is based on signaling default (yes or no) the selection by the subscriber terminal (13), based on the signaled PLMN ID.” (emphasis added)

Nothing in Kauranen et al. either discloses or suggests selection of the PLMN ID by signaling default (yes or no) the subscriber terminal (13) to include in the selection of PLMN. Support for the amendment to claim 53 is found in the specification of the present application on page 8, lines 3-10)

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claims 30-58 are patentable over the prior art of record and requests that the application be passed to issuance.

CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

If entry and consideration of the amendments above requires an extension of time, Applicants respectfully request that this be considered a petition therefor. The Assistant Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee(s) due in this connection to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

ADDITIONAL FEE

Please charge any insufficiency of fees, or credit any excess, to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

Respectfully submitted,
NORRIS McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By *Christa Hildebrand*
Christa Hildebrand
Reg. No. 34,953
875 Third Avenue - 18th Floor
New York, New York 10022
Phone: (212) 808-0700
Fax: (212) 808-0844
Facsimile: (212)808-0844

00146136CH/CFC